

REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 11-14, 19-32, 34, 40 and 44-46 were presented for examination and claims 1-9, 11-14, 19-32, 34, 40 and 44-46 were rejected. Claims 1, 19 and 25 have been amended. No new matter was added. Upon entry of the present amendments, Claims 1-9, 11-14, 19-32, 34, 40 and 44-46 are currently pending in this application. Applicants submit that pending claims 1-9, 11-14, 19-32, 34, 40 and 44-46 are patentable and in condition for allowance.

A Notice of Appeal was filed with the Office on August 9, 2010. Applicants submit herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) with the proper fee and therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the appeal.

The following comments address all stated grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully traverse all rejections and urge the Examiner to withdraw finality of the rejection, and pass the claims to allowance in view of the remarks set forth below.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 19-24 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for claiming non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to Claim 19 overcome this rejection. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 19 claims a system that satisfies the machine or transformation test because it recites a computer system that comprises a processor which executes a presentation-level protocol and an event manager. The computer system is a particular machine because it is a machine that is particularly configured to execute a presentation-level protocol and an event manager. Thus, Claim 19 is tied to a particular machine and therefore recites patentable subject matter. Claims 20-24 and 44-45 also recite patentable subject matter because these claims depend on and incorporate the patentable subject matter of Claim 19.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103**I. Claims 1-4, 11-13, 19-20, 25, 27-28 and 44-46**

Claims 1-4, 11-13, 19-20, 25, 27-28 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0128412 to Harrison (“Harrison”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,464,133 to Kasasaku (“Kasasaku”) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,337,238 to Nishio (“Nishio.”) Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-4, 11-13, 19-20,

25, 27-28 and 44-46 as previously presented are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Nevertheless, Applicants hereby amend Claims 1, 19 and 25 to more clearly recite the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 1-4, 11-13, 19-20, 25, 27-28 and 44-46 are patentable and in a condition for allowance.

Prima facie obviousness requires demonstrating that a cited reference, either alone or in combination with another reference, teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio fail to teach or suggest binding an event notification to generate binding information that includes a COM port number for the virtual communication channel, the device name, the product identifier and the universal identifier.

The Examiner admits that Harrison does not teach or suggest binding the event notification to a port number to generate binding information. *See* Office Action mailed on April 8, 2010, page 4. The Examiner relies on Kasasaku to cure this deficiency in Harrison.

Kasasaku also does not teach or suggest generating binding information that includes a COM port number for the virtual communication channel, the device name, the product identifier and the universal identifier. Rather, at best Kasasaku describes mapping a physical port on a client to a virtual port on a server. At no point does Kasasaku describe generating binding information that includes a COM port number for the virtual communication channel, a device name, a product identifier and a universal identifier. Thus, Kasasaku does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Similarly, Nishio does not describe generating binding information that includes a COM port number for the virtual communication channel, a device name, a product identifier and a universal identifier. Rather, Nishio merely describes an event notification, not binding information.

In light of the above-remarks, Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable over any combination of Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio. Claims 2-4, 11-13, 20, 27-28 and 44-46 are also patentable over any combination of Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio because these claims depend on and incorporate patentable Claims 1, 19 and 25. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

II. Claims 5 and 26

Claims 5 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,024,501 to Wright (“Wright.”) Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5 and 26 are patentable over any combination of Harrison, Kasasaku, Nishio and Wright.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 5 and 26 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 5 and 26 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1, 19 and 25. Like Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio, Wright also fails to teach or suggest binding an event notification to generate binding information that includes a COM port number for the virtual communication channel, the device name, the product identifier and the universal identifier. Thus, Wright fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

III. Claims 6, 9, 21-22, 29 and 32

Claims 6, 9, 21-22, 29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,325,026 to North (“North.”) Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 6, 9, 21-22, 29 and 32 are patentable over any combination of Harrison, Kasasaku, Nishio and North.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 6, 9, 21-22, 29 and 32 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 6, 9, 21-22, 29 and 32 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1, 19 and 25. Like Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio, North also fails to teach or suggest binding an event notification to generate binding information that includes a COM port number for the virtual communication channel, the device name, the product identifier and the universal identifier. Thus, North fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed

invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

IV. Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31

Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Harrison, Kasasaku, Nishio and North in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,051,108 to Jones ("Jones.") Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31 are patentable over any combination of Harrison, Kasasaku, Nishio, North and Jones.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 7-8, 23-24 and 30-31 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1, 19 and 25. Like Harrison, Kasasaku, North and Nishio, Jones also fails to teach or suggest binding an event notification to generate binding information that includes a COM port number for the virtual communication channel, the device name, the product identifier and the universal identifier. Thus, Jones fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

V. Claims 14, 34 and 40

Claims 14, 34 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,895,588 to Ruberg ("Ruberg.") Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14, 34 and 40 are patentable over any combination of Harrison, Kasasaku, Nishio and Ruberg.

Establishing *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention requires that the prior art teach or suggest each claim limitation. In view of the arguments stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19 and 25 are patentable and in a condition for allowance. Therefore Claims 14, 34 and 40 are also patentable and in a condition for allowance because Claims 14, 34 and 40 depend on and incorporate all the patentable subject matter of Claims 1, 19 and 25. Like Harrison, Kasasaku and Nishio, Ruberg also fails to teach or suggest

binding an event notification to generate binding information that includes a COM port number for the virtual communication channel, the device name, the product identifier and the universal identifier. Thus, Ruberg fails to detract from the patentability of the claimed invention. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims.

CONCLUSION

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicants contend that each of the Examiner's rejections have been adequately addressed and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of finality of the rejection, and allowance of all of the pending claims.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with Applicants' representative would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' representative at the telephone number identified below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 8, 2010

CHOATE, HALL & STEWART, LLP

Choate, Hall & Stewart, LLP
Two International Place
Boston, MA 02110
(617) 248-5000 (phone)
(617) 502-5002 (fax)

/Kellan D. Ponikiewicz/
Kellan D. Ponikiewicz
Registration No. 59,701